140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

- Speaker Ryan: "The House will be in order and the Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Reverend John Hippard from the First Baptist Church of Shelbyville. Reverend Hippard."
- Reverend Hippard: "Shall we pray? Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we thank You for Your daily mercies, the blessings that You give to us in abundance. Thank You for the peace and prosperity that this great land enjoys at Your hand. We pray today, our Father, for these Representatives; that You'll give them mental acuity, moral fortitude and spiritual discernment that they might do what is right and good for this state and honorable in Your sight. We ask this all in Christ's name. Amen."
- Speaker Ryan: "Thank you, Reverend. Representative Darrow will lead the pledge."
- Darrow, et al: "I pledge allegiance to the Plag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands; one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Ryan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. With 164 Members answering the Roll, a quorum of the House is present. Introduction, Pirst Reading of House Bills."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2683, Ebbesen, a Bill for an Act to authorize the issuance of obligations of units of government in registered forms. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Ryan: "Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Tuerk, Chairman from the Committee on Labor and Commerce, to which the following subject matter was heard, action taken November 17, 1982 and reported back the following: that the majority of the Work

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Share Subcommittee was accepted. The majority report of the Work Share Subcommittee was accepted."

Speaker Ryan: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of
Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House
in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit:
House Bill 746, together with attached Amendments hereto
and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of
the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Amendment #1
to House Bill 746 passed the Senate as amended November 17,
1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to ask for a recess for a Republican conference immediately in room 114, and I would say 45 minutes, Sir."

Speaker Ryan: "About an hour, I would imagine."

Friedrich: "About an hour."

Speaker Ryan: "Representative Telcser, do you have any excused absences? Representative Getty? Representative Ronan in the House this morning? Is he here? Oh, cutting a deal with Telcser. I see. You told me they were going to forget you, Art. Representative Bower, would you come to the podium, please? Representative Getty, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, to respond to your query,
there are no requests for excused absences on the
Democratic side."

Speaker Ryan: "I'm certainly glad to hear that."

Getty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, also, to state that I've been requested... Representative Grei... in Representative Greiman's place, to request a Democratic caucus also immediately at the appropriate room."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "What room do you want? What room do you usually

use?"

Getty: "118."

Speaker Ryan: "118?"

Getty: "118."

Speaker Ryan: "Alright, 118. Democrat conference in room 118.

Immediately, Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Yes."

Speaker Ryan: "Well, I understand that we have Miss Illinois the back of the chamber; and, if we don't introduce her now, it's going to be a couple hours before we can get that done. And I think, if Representative Bower is in the chamber, he should come to the podium immediately. Alright. We're going to break now for conferences. Illinois is going to come back later, because the Senate's not available for her. And I told her that, as far as the House was concerned, she was much more important than the Senate, but... The Democrats are going to caucus in 118 immediately, and the Republicans are going to caucus in 114 immediately. And I would advise everybody to go to the room immediately. Stand... The House will stand in recess until 12:30. The House will be in order, and the Members will please be in their seats. On page 16 of the Calendar, under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, appears House Bill 394, Representative Plinn."

Flinn: "Let me get organized here, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker,
Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the
specific recommendations of the Governor on House Bill 394.
To refresh your memory, 394 was designed to eliminate a
small transportation district in downtown Chicago, and my
Bill was used as a vehicle for doing it. The Governor
suggests that 60 days is not enough time to eliminate all
the business that has to be done to eliminate the district,

140th Legislative Day

and he suggested one year. And all those who are concerned with it agree with it, and so I would move for the adoption of my Motion."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any debate? Representative Hallock. do you have debate? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 394 by adoption of the Amendment? . All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Hastert 'aye'. On this question, there are 156 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'present' and 20 voting 'absent'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 394 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill ... House Bill 579, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory action on House Bill 579. Essentially, the Amendment provides for the orderly method for county board members to determine their length of terms after each decennial census; and, essentially, they will do it the same way that the Senate does — the staggered terms. And the Amendment also provides, with the method for the boards who have already been elected, to determine prior to their seating the sixth of December for determining their length of terms; and, after that, it provides for this to be done every ten years after the sentence... by... after the census by the first of September, I believe. I move for acceptance of the Governor's Amendment."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any debate? Any questions?

Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Question of the Sponsor."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Speaker Ryan: "Indicates he'll yield."

Bowman: "Representative McMaster, I have on my desk a veto analysis which indicates that the...(cut off)... which indicates that the Motion filed differs from the Governor's recommended changes in a couple of respects. Is that correct?"

McMaster: "Yes. What we did, upon examining his message, I found that there were some problems with the... determining the length of terms of newly elected county board members after... who were elected after the first of Dec... September. And, since this Bill was not approved or anything done prior to September 1st, there was no way to accommodate the newly elected county boards. We have made the necessary changes with the agreement of the Governor's Office, and so this new Amendment that I filed yesterday was accepted by the Governor and is, in effect, the Governor's amendatory veto message."

Bowman: "Representative McMaster, one further question. I've...

I've never seen this happen before; although, maybe it has, and I just don't recall. Does not the legislation have to have the... passed in the same form in the House and the Senate and be approved by the Governor exactly in the same form? And, since he's already filed his amendatory veto recommendations, now can we... are we at liberty to do this; and, if we were to adopt this and the Senate to concur, would then this be lawful?"

McMaster: "Woods, in effect, the new Motion that was filed yesterday is the Governor's amendatory veto message and will accompany this legislation over to the Senate. I have talked to the Senate Sponsor and the Democrat Senator who made some Amendments on the Bill in the Senate, and it is in agreement with him. I see no problem, since it is, in effect, the Governor's veto message, Woody."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Bowman: "Well, but doesn't the Governor's amendatory veto message, which is on file with the Index Division of the Secretary of State, have to agree in all respects with what we pass? That's what I'm asking."

McMaster: "I think that this message is the one that will be on file or is on file."

Bowman: "Okay. So, the Governor is offering, in effect, another amendatory veto message which will... with this."

McMaster: "Perhaps, in effect, that's what it is."

Bowman: "I hope so. Thank you very much."

McMaster: "Yes. And, I would like to add that this Bill has an immediate effective date and will require 107 votes."

Speaker Ryan: "Is there any further discussion? Representative

Getty. Representative Conti is in the Chair.

Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, and to further clarify the question that was raised by Representative Bowman, I would refer to Article IX, Section 9(E) of the Illinois Constitution which says that the Bill shall be considered in the same manner as a vetoed Bill, but spe...the specific recommendations may be accepted by a record vote of the majority of the Members elected to each House. Such Bills shall be presented again to the Governor; and, if he certifies that such acceptance conforms to his specific recommendations, the Bill shall become law. Is it my... And now I ask, if the Gentleman will yield, having cited the constitutional provision, is it my understanding, Representative McMaster, that the Governor has issued a new amendatory veto which your Motion will conform to?"

McNaster: "I can't fully answer that. It's my understanding that
he is in agreement with it; and, in other words, if this
current Motion is successful in both the House and the
Senate then, of course, it does have to go back to him.

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

And then he..."

Getty: "Well..."

McMaster: "... in effect, has agreed to accept it."

- Getty: "Well, what I am saying is that the language of the Constitution seems to clearly say that, if he certifies that such acceptance conforms to his specific recommendations now what you're saying is that your Motion does not conform to his specific recommendations but what it conforms to is what he has now agreed to do."

 McMaster: "Yes."
- Getty: "And what I'm suggesting to you is that the Governor ought to issue a new or corrected, I should say, version that he can then certify that your Motion conforms to."
- McMaster: "Well, I will certainly recommend that to the Governor."
- Getty: "Well, what I'm suggesting to you, Sir, is that you may and I'm not sure. I think this is a case of first impression here. You may be placing your Bill in jeopardy, and I might suggest you... you just may want to take this out of the record until you can clarify that point and suggest that the Governor correct his amendatory veto so that your Motion would conform, when we pass it in this House, would conform to his corrected amendatory veto."
- McNaster: "If that is the wish of the floor, Nike, this is what we will do. I see no problem with it. I don't want this to, of course, be placed in the jeopardy of failing to be considered today or tomorrow."
- Getty: "I... I am not opposing your legislation at all. All
 I'm suggesting to you is that, if you were to adopt this,
 if this House were to adopt this and the Governor had not
 already issued his corrected amendatory veto, that you
 might have a fatal defect and your law may be held,
 subsequently by a court, to be a nullity."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

McMaster: "Thank you, Mike. I will explore that with my staff aide. And, Mr. Speaker, will you take this out of the record for the time being?"

Speaker Conti: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 608, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 608. This is an Act to create the Child Passenger Restraint Act, and what the Governor did, effect, was to phase in the enforcement of the law which requires children to be restrained in car seats. Now. under the Governor's amendatory veto, starting July 1st of 1983, children who are the age of... from birth through the age of one, up until their 2nd birthday, they shall be required to be in car restraints. Also, four and five year-olds would be required to be in seat belts. Then, a year later, July 1st of 1984, children from birth through age of three, up until their 4th birthday, would be required to be in restraints, and children from ages four and five would be required to be in seat belts. The Governor has put into the Bill an exception saying that the provisions of the Bill shall not be applicable when the child's parent or quardian is providing for the personal needs of the child. I... I interpret that to mean that, if the child is being breast fed or if the parents are changing the child's diapers, that would come under a personal need and that they would be exempt from the requirements of the law. The Governor has indicated that the fine for this offense shall only be 25 dollars and that, if you have a proof of purchase of a car seat or a rental, then the fine would be waived. I think that's excellent addition to the Bill. The Governor has also exempted out... exempted recreational vehicles from

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

provision of the law. This is still an excellent piece of legislation and will end up saving lives. I think it's a very significant piece of legislation that everyone should accept. It had an overwhelming vote when we first voted on it with 114 'aye' votes in the House. Many of you who voted 'present' or 'no', I'm sure, can now support it with the Governor's amendatory veto, and I move that we accept the amendatory veto of the Governor on House Bill 608."

Speaker Conti: "The Gentleman from Marion, Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I know what the outcome is going to be. So, I'm not going to make a long speech. I would remind you that, if this Bill becomes law, you're making it a crime for a mother to hold her baby in her arms. Now, how far you want to go and make the government protective of everybody for everything I don't know, but I'll tell you you've gone a long ways. And now you've watered this thing down to where you'll clutter up the court records when somebody's got an excuse, 'Well, I had a seat ordered', 'I was changing the diaper' — whatever. But, nevertheless, I would remind you again that, when we start making it a crime for a mother to hold her baby in her arms, we've gone too darn far, as far as I'm concerned. I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Conti: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barr."

Barr: "Just an inquiry, Mr. Speaker. We have two Motions on our desk on this Bill - Motion #1 and Motion #2. Which one are we considering?"

Speaker Conti: "Motion #2. Representative Cullerton's."

Barr: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Conti: "Are there any further discussions?

Representative Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might point out that this Bill is cosponsored... I've cosponsored this Bill with

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Representative Daniels. He also filed an additional... an identical Motion, and he asked me to handle my Motion on this Bill. And I certainly appreciate the help that Representative Daniels gave on the passage of the Bill. 1 would just briefly indicate that we're not making it a crime for a mother to hold her baby in her arms. same type of a quasi-criminal offense that you would analogize to failing to purchase a vehicle sticker for your That's what we're talking about. And, really what we're doing is saying ... We're providing the function of providing education for the populus in letting them that, if they do get stopped by a police officer, they're reminded what the law is. The law provides for a warning ticket for the first offense. They are simply then ... go out and purchase a car seat or rent a car seat, and then they would not receive... even receive a fine. There are some amazing statistics concerning deaths of children don't want to have to go through all of them. I think people have become aware of the serious nature of children being killed in cars. We will be saving money for our citizens, and we'll be saving lives. Therefore, I would ask again for your support in accepting the Governor's amendatory veto of House Bill 608."

Speaker Conti: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 608... or House Bill rather, 608 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor will vote by 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the... Representative Stearney 'aye'. Take the record. This Motion recei... On this question, this Motion received 127 votes... 'aye' votes, 30 'nay' votes, 3 'present', 17 'absent'. It received the Constitutional Majority —

140th Legislative Day

prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 608 by adoption of this Amendment. House Bill 1244, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House Bill 1244. House Bill 1244 is a measure to provide financial incentives to single-family homeowners of historic property who engage in their restoration and preservation. The Governor's Amendments are technical in nature. They improve the Bill, and I hope that the House will give it the resounding 'yes' vote now that it did in June."

Speaker Conti: "Is there any discussion on the Bill? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1244 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor will vote by voting 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 164 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1244 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1971, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 197... has been amendatorily vetoed by the Governor to remove the provision in House Bill 1971 for changing the method of execution in the State of Illinois from electrocution to lethal injection. I now move that the House speci... or that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change. I think you all remember the Bill which added in some changes in

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

the death penalty statute that addressed felony and witnessed murder and addressed a couple of other changes, in terms of age and inclusions in the felony/murder category. I will answer any questions that you have; but, at this point, I would move, Mr. Speaker, for an 'aye' vote on accepting the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Conti: "Is there any debate? There being none, will the Clerk take the record? I'm sorry. There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1971 by adoption of the Amendment? . All those in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. all voted who wish? Record Stearney as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 139 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. The question... The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 12... 1971. House Bill 2102, Representative Levin."

Levin: "McAuliffe is going to present it. Is he here?"

Speaker Conti: "Representative McAuliffe in the chambers? He doesn't seem to be in the chambers. What do you want to do, Representative Ellis (sic - Levin). Take it out of the record. House Bill 2133, Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo, on your Motion."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On House Bill 2133, the Governor made three specific recommendations for change. He indicated that property to be annexed into the Metropolitan Sanitary District, which was the same language in another Bill that he previously signed, Senate Bill 1368, should be deleted as being extraneous.

140th Legislative Day

- November 18, 1982
- Secondly, for the Medical Center Commission boundaries, there were some difficulties and problems with the language in the Bill. He asked that that be changed. And, thirdly, for employees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District who wish to be employees for public office, they would be restrained by the provisions of the Federal Hatch Act. I move to accept the Governor's recommendations for change on House Bill 2133."
- Speaker Conti: "Is there any dis... any discussion?

 Representative Pullen, from Cook."
- Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question... a couple questions, please."
- Speaker Conti: "He... He indicates he'll yield."
- Pullen: "Does this Bill contain the provision that would validate, after the fact, the illegal appropriation and tax levy ordinances of the Cook County Forest Preserve and the Cook County Board?"
- Steczo: "Yes, it does, and the Governor has already approved those provisions."
- Pullen: "So, you're saying that, if we accept his recommendations for change, that that validation of the illegal appropriation and tax levy ordinances would go through?"
- Steczo: "I'm not sure about illegal, but that provision would go through, and the Governor has already expressed that he has no problem with those provisions."
- Pullen: "Well, I do. Why would it be necessary for us to validate appropriation and tax levy ordinances after that fact in one county and one forest preserve district?"
- Steczo: "Representative Pullen, I don't think that's the issue that we're discussing right now. We're discussing the Governor's recommendations for change, and that issue in itself was discussed when the original Bill was heard last July."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Pullen: "Mr. Sponsor, is this amendatory veto Motion identical to the Governor's amendatory veto language?"

Steczo: "There was a technical problem with regards to the amendatory veto message. It was brought to the attention of the Governor. The Governor said that the language that is presented in this veto Motion is acceptable; that he would certify the language contained herein. The..."

Pullen: "Well, Sir, a few minutes ago there was a considerable controversy about the exact same situation with another Bill, and that Sponsor agreed to take it out of the record.

And, I wonder whether you would do the same in this situation?

Steczo: "Representative Pullen, I think this situation is a little bit different, due to the... due to the nature of the amendatory veto message. In the second paragraph of the amendatory veto message, the Governor refers to Senate Bill 1368 which contained extraordinary... or excessive material and language. The problem with the Governor's message was that he misnamed two Sections instead of just one, but he did say that the language in Senate Bill 1368 was excessive. So, we have taken care of the excessive language that was contained in House Bill 2133."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Motion for a moment, please."

Speaker Conti: "Proceed."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in accepting the Governor's amendatory language or changing it, as this Motion does, in repassing this law, what this House would be doing would be to validate, after the fact, illegally adopted appropriation and tax levy ordinances..."

Speaker Conti: "Can we have some order, please? Can we have some order?"

Pullen: "What we would be doing by voting 'yes' on this Motion is

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

to write into law the validation, after the fact, of illegally adopted appropriation and tax levy ordinances for Cook County and the Cook County Forest Preserve District for Fiscal Years 1979 and 1980. This is being done, Ladies and Gentlemen, because those agencies do not follow the state law with respect to the way they adopt their ordinances, because they don't want to line appropriations the way we do and the way every other county The effect of in this state does. this is to cheat taxpayers of the opportunity to successfully protest their taxes, and I think that it's time that this General Assembly stop this back-door, sneaky practice. And, ought to reject this Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Conti: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change Bill 2133 by with respect to House adoption of the Amendment? . **A11** those in favor voting 'aye', and all opposed will vote 'nay'. Record Stearney as 'aye'. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This Bill receiving 117 'aye' votes, 48 'nay', 5 *present*. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2133 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 2234, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies.... the Governor's recommendations relative to House Bill 2234. The Bill. as originally introduced, provided that the State Board promulgate guidelines in those districts where there is a shortfall of funds at military establishments and providing for a fee to parents of students who live on installations. That provision has been deleted in the

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Governor's recommendations. Also, hе has included provision extending community college terms to six years, rather than four years. As you know, we passed a wherein community colleges in Cook County the terms are four extended to six years. This would provide that that be done statewide now. Ħе has kept a provision with regards to special ed. where the building fund. eight-year limitation where levies for a building fund, if there are... they can use that for other purposes within the eight-year limitation. I would move that we accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 2234 by adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Conti: "Any further discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out to the Gentleman in this Motion includes... the Bill includes a number of provisions, one of which the Governor didn't change, but it's too bad that he didn't strike out. This Bill has a number of provisions, as I said, but one of which that I think you ought to be aware of ... that you're aware is that it allows the district that has levied special education building tax; and, where they don't need that money, they can now transfer that into some other area where they do need the money. Now, this is sort of the old march-of-dimes approach. When you raise money to cure a problem and then the problem ceases to exists, you still want to be able to raise the money and spend it for some other area. In effect, what you're actually doing here is allowing a school district to levy an additional tax; because, if they can't use the money, then there's no reason for them to continue to levy the tax. So, they'll be able to use the money. So, they can continue to levy the tax, which is basically the same thing as levying

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

an additional tax. So, just as long as you know what you're doing. This is... doesn't provide any type of referendum or anything like that. For those of you who have constituents who complain about their real estate taxes, this will, instead of providing where the law would ordinarily a reduction in their taxes, it will keep their taxes up."

Speaker Conti: "Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield to a guestion?"

Speaker Conti: "He indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Matijevich, who proposed the, to your knowledge, the Governor's amendatory change that makes the entire community college system have six-year terms for its members?"

Matijevich: "I would guess the Community College Trustees
Association, Representative Stuffle. I... but I..."

Stuffle: "To your knowledge that's where it came from?"

Matijevich: "Only to my knowledge and my best guess. I would say, in fact, I wasn't going to say it on the House floor, because I always forgive and forget. But, I might as well say it. This is the first time, since I've been in the Legislature that a Governor has not talked to the Chief Sponsor of a Bill when he put a provision on it, and I didn't like that. And, I don't think it's good policy. So, I might as well say it now in hopes that none of you are ever treated that way in the future."

Stuffle: "Second question. The Governor changed the provision of the Bill regarding those students from military families where a school district has to recoup funds because of a lack of or a reduction in federal impact aid. If the Governor makes that change in this Bill, how will they recoup those funds?"

Matijevich: "Well, the only thing we've got going for us now is,

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

I know in my school district my superintendent is going to Washington to meet with both Senator Percy and Senator Dixon and say, 'You know, we tried this route; and, evidentally, the Governor feels that it is unconstitutional'. So now, at least, they've got a talking point to go to the Senators in hopes that we can..."

Speaker Conti: "Representative..."

Matijevich: "In hopes that we can get some federal impact aid increases, because they..."

Speaker Conti: "The Gentleman from Marion, Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the... I'll tell you where this six-year deal comes from. It comes from the trustees. I had a whole lot of letters from one of the districts in my area saying they wanted a six-year listen to this. The reason was they didn't Now, want to be subjected to pressures from the taxpayers and the voters in their district. Whoopee! Wouldn't you like to be relieved of pressure from the taxpayers, supporters and the people in your district? That would be great. I happen to believe this is self-government, and I happen to believe that college trustees that are elected should be responsible to the people that they're elected by and that they impose taxes upon. Why on earth should a college trustee be given a six-year term and you have two-year term? I can't figure that out. I think they ought to run for election at least every four years and be accountable to the people who... on who they impose tax."

Speaker Conti: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Conti: "He indicates he will."

Katz: "I seem to remember that it was only a short time ago that we amended the Library Board Bill to reduce terms that were six years to four years. We were told that the reason was

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

you couldn't get good people to run, because they didn't want to be tied up for six years. Now, would you explain to me the logic of that in view of what you're doing here, which is to require that you only have six-year terms on community college boards?"

Matijevich: "Well, the only... the only way I can answer that is, evidentally, the Governor feels, after talking to the Trustees Association, that they want a universal application. In other words, you have six-year terms for Cook County trustees, and they want to make it the same throughout the State of Illinois. That's the only way I can answer it, Harold."

Speaker Conti: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Only on the special ed. provision, I think one of the prior speakers may have led us to think that the building fund dollars can be utilized for any other educational purposes. believe the language in the law or the Bill in front of us would allow it only for special ed. purposes out of a special ed. building fund with the unanimous consent of the So, I don't believe that would frivolous. school board. And, before us today and tomorrow will be an amendatory provision dealing with... reduction rather, not amendatory, but a reduction provision in the veto message asking us not million dollars for special ed. Well, you to restore 22 can't have it both ways. You can't short programs and expect them to be restored without a tax increase. What you have here then, at least, is a mechanism for providing for special ed. funds. And so, of the three elements of this amendatory veto, the one on special ed, I think, meritorious, I would ask that you support and it. Possibly, there's too much in the Bill because of the trustee issue and maybe the federal facilities, but I do

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

think, on the special ed. aspect of the Bill which was Representative Yourell's Bill a number of years ago and consistently over the last three or four, I think many of us have voted for it. And I would encourage you to support the amendatory veto for that reason."

Speaker Conti: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to shed a little light on the area special ed. and that levy for special ed. building purposes, but Representative Schneider has accomplished that purpose. But, I would like to address myself to the other issue in the Bill, which is the extension of the junior college trustees terms to six years. One individual in the House stated that this was an idea of the trustees of the junior colleges. That is not true. idea propounded to the State Ele... to the Election Laws Commission and also the State Board of Elections during our public hearings of on consolidation elections throughout the State of Illinois. At that time, this is four or five years ago, the Junior College Board suggested that we should go to six-year terms: and, because we couldn't pass the Bill in that form, we amended it, as you know, in this Session to include only those junior colleges in Cook County. Now, the Governor has wisely indicated that, if it's good for Cook County, it should be good for the rest of the state, because many of my colleagues have appealed to the Governor to place that amendatory on the Bill. So, what we've done all through that election procedure in those public hearings and debate was to extend terms. Ιn no instance did we ever diminish terms to anything less than what they were before; and, in many instances, we increased the term of office. This is a product, this is the thinking of the Illinois Junior

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

College Board, and I would hope that you would sustain the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Conti: "Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ιf mу nemory serves шe correctly, before consolidation of elections, community college trustees terms were only three years and then they recently extended to four years because of consolidation. Now we seem to be moving to six years, which is practically unheard of as far as elected office goes. It totally seems to me to remove responsibility from those that are elected and doesn't serve our constituents. needs; but, more than anything, I think I find this Bill almost unfair to ask us to vote on. And this is something that goes on here over, and over and over again. There are two issues in this Bill that we're being asked to vote on together that are just totally unrelated. My personal feelings are that I would like to support one Section of the Bill, and I find the other Section so offensive that just couldn't possibly support it. So, I'm going to have to vote against the Bill and maybe come back at a later time with a Bill that would simply implement the first Section of the Bill. I would recommend that to some of the others of you who may be in question about the Bill: at this time, I would also ask for a ruling from the Speaker or the Parliamentarian as to the germaneness of the Section that was added by the Governor. It totally unrelated to the original Bill. The original Bill deals with a tax levy for special education building funds. The addition deals with the Election Code and the term of election of officers. So, I would appreciate a ruling, please, from the Chair on that matter."

Speaker Conti: "It'll take a moment. Just a minute."

Zwick: "Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

- Speaker Conti: "The Parliamentarian informs me the question is germane. Representative Matijevich, to close."
- Matijevich: "Yes, I would urge the Members to support this. Bus Yourell is absolutely right. What you would be doing if you voted against this Bill, and I understand your emotion about that part of the issue. And I do not ... I was one did not support, in the Constitution, providing the Governor with an amendatory veto power, because eventually, it was going to be abused. However, if you do not support this Bill - make no mistake about it - all you would be hurting would be the special ed. handicapped students. That's all you would be doing. And, the special ed. has been hurt enough by the veto pen. And, believe me, local government is going to be hurt by the loss of funds on the Corporate Property Fund replacement, the loss of revenues. We're being hurt enough. So, please support this Bill; otherwise, what you are doing to special ed. would be devastating. So, I urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Conti: "Representative Husk... What purpose do you rise,
 Representative?"
- Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you didn't recognize me. I wanted to speak against this Bill and point out a couple points in it, and you didn't recognize me to ... to speak."
- Speaker Conti: "Your light wasn't on."
- Huskey: "It must not be working up there. It was working back here, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Conti: "I'm sorry. Your light doesn't register up here."
- Huskey: "Can I... Well, I'll have to explain my vote then, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Conti: "You can explain your vote. The question is,

 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific
 recommendations for change with respect to House Bill
 2234?'. All those in favor vote... will vote 'aye', all

140th Legislative Day

opposed will vote 'nay'. Record Stearney as 'aye'.

Representative Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you'll notice in this Bill, it has a community college extending the years from four years to six-year terms, and it's locking in trustees that have only been elected to two-year terms. It's extending their terms on to six years. So, it's taking the authority of the power to vote for community college trustees out of the voters! hands. and it's putting it in the halls of this General Assembly. Actually, and it's only happening in Cook County. to beg of you people downstate. Don't force this six-year community college term on us. Let our voters... Let our voters ... Let our voters have the chance to vote for their community college trustees. Don't lock these community college trustees that have been elected for terms to expire next year or the year after. This is a bad Bill. should not be passed on the community college. The other part of the Bill is a good Bill, but this is on a very, very... This Bill on the community college part on the Governor's amendatory veto is a very, very bad Bill, and it should be defeated."

Speaker Conti: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 137 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'nay', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2234 by adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes DiPrima for an announcement."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Representative Conti. We are honored with the presence of last year's Commander of the American Legion, Mel Smith. I'd like to introduce Mel Smith, past

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Commander of the American Legion."

- Mel Smith: "It's nice to be with you this afternoon and see you really getting down to business."
- DiPrima: "Thank you, Commander. Now we have the new Commander of the American Legion for the ensuing year, Larry Wesson...

 Besson."
- Larry 'Besson': "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I came here today to thank you most heartedly for your support of veterans' legislation this past year, and we are looking forward to the same in the coming years. Thank you very much."
- DiPrima: "Alright. Now, as a rule, Bob Mitchel and I do. Every year we make up a list of the veterans... of the Members who have supported veterans' legislation. Then we see to it that they get either a Legion citation, or a VFW, AMVET, War Veterans or a Disabled American Veterans Jewish citations. Due to the confusion this year, they didn't get them out in time. We usually want them presented before the election when you can use them most, but due to a little mix up we didn't get them until now. Now, those of you that got letters, we have the Legion citations down in room 118. Now, I'm going to go down there, and those of you that have received the notice that you are entitled to receive a Legion citation, come downstairs and we'll make the presentation to you in room 118, downstairs. I'm going down with the Commanders. Thank you."

Speaker Conti: "Larry... me again. Lee Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "On the Calendar, under Amendatory Veto Motions,

House Bill 579, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have discussed this amendatory message and the changes that were made in that message with the Governor's people and with Mr. Getty, and I want the

140th Legislative Day

- November 18, 1982
- record to clearly indicate that it is the feeling of those involved, including the Governor's people, that what we are doing is, in effect, implementing the intent of the Governor's veto message. And I want that clearly indicated in the record. Now, I would urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? With the House's indulgence, I would like to re-introduce Representative DiPrima for a moment."
- DiPrima: "Oh God. Thank you, Lee. Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, we also have today the State Commander of the AMVETS, and there are AMVET citations to be given out in room 118. So, those of you that got letters from the AMVETS, we will also make that present... them presentations. This is Frank 'Gudgeon', the new Department Commander of the AMVETS."
- Frank 'Gudgeon': "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. And
 I'm hoping that you will continue to do the great things
 you have been doing for the AMVETS and all the veterans in
 the State of Illinois. Continue to do the great job that
 you have been doing. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McMaster has moved for the acceptance of the Governor's recommendation for change on House Bill 579. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I'm rising to, I think, comment on Representative McMaster's representation. I am informed, and we had a conference, Representative McMaster and I, with the representative of the Governor's Office, that they are satisfied; that the Motion which does change the Governor's amendatory veto message can be certified as conforming. I just want to make it clear, as a technical point, that that is an issue that has never been litigated by the courts, and that this action, although I'm not going

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

to oppose it, is fraught with danger; that we could well find that a court would hold that this adoption was a nullity since the Motion does not conform to the Governor's amendatory veto message and there has been no correction of that."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Marion,
 Representative Dwight Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Getty has raised a very interesting point. In my opinion, there's nothing in the Constitution that says that anything can be done to an amendatory veto except override it or accept it as his specific recommendation. I think we've had about three or four Bills around here that comes out here and they fiddle around and amend them the way they want to. I have nothing against Representative McMaster's Bill, but I believe this is about the fourth one this has happened to. I think it's really illegal. Somebody takes it to court, and far be me to decide that. But, it certainly is from conforming to the Constitution."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman, Representative McMaster, to close."
- McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this has been fully discussed, and I urge a 'yes' vote. This is not a controversial Bill, and I think everyone agrees to that."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 579 by adoption of the Amendment?'. All in favor will vote by signifying 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Senator Fawell. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this Motion, there are 154 'aye', none voting 'no', 9 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails, and

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 579 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 2588, Representative Giorgi. Gentleman in the chambers? House Bill 2588, Representative Giorgi. Motion out of the record. Representative Giorgi wishes that Motion be taken out of the record. Is that correct, Sir? That is correct. Representative Bell. Out of the record. Representative Collins, House Bill 2588. Read the Motion."

- Collins: "Thank Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for change of House Bill 2588 which, of course, is the unitary reporting Bill. The amendatory veto does three things. First, it defines the unitary group as one in which the members are in the same business using the three-factor apportionment formula and are functionally inter-rated. Secondly, it provides unitary reporting for domestic operations only and prohibits worldwide unitary reporting. A unitary group of businesses cannot include foreign operations in its income tax reporting. And, finally, it permits foreign dividends to be treated in the same manner as domestic dividends. Additionally, sales between domestic and foreign members of a unitary group will be treated the same as inter-company sales between members who are totally domestic. I would ask for the adoption of the Governor's recommendations."
- Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Bell."
- Bell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the original Sponsor of the Amendment #1 to House Bill 2588, which was the unitary Bill, I urge everyone to give a green vote to Representative Collins on his Motion and that we do accept the Governor's amendatory

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

language."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman from Dixon, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a result of the amendatory veto action by the Governor, a major industry looking to come to Illinois has suggested to this Representative that we support the amendatory veto. I'm speaking of Iowa Beef of Dakota City, Nebraska. I urge an affirmative vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Bowman, you wish to speak, Sir?"

Bowman: "Yes, I'd like to speak against the proposal."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Bowman: "I'd like to point out that the trend nationwide is in the other direction; that currently thirteen states apply the combined approach to multi-national corporation and twenty-six apply to multi-state businesses. The last two years four states, including New York and Massachusetts which are major industrial state, and Minnesota industrial states - have adopted the approach. If Illinois accepts this amendatory language or indeed passes the legislation at all, we will be the first state to back... go backwards. And I believe the trend nationwide will continue. So that I think we can look forward to the future where more and more states will be adopting this approach; and, consequently, Illinois' action that we are considering today would seem even more archaic. the ... the Assembly to reject this Motion and to reject the Motion to override. We cannot afford any additional revenue loss. I would point out that the unitary method is able to provide us with additional revenues; that we will lose whether we pass the Bill or accept the amendatory language. We cannot, at this present time in the desparate condition our state is in, afford that. The Governor had a

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

press conference today saying that we are in a desparate straights. I don't understand how he can have press conferences like that and then support an abolition of the inheritance tax and support changes like this that cripple our ability to raise revenue. I urge a 'no' vote on this and a 'no' vote on Representative Bell's Motion."

- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, to close."
- Collins: "Well, thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just point out that most business leaders have agreed that this is the best compromise available in this area of the unitary tax system. The Committee on State Taxation which represents nearly 200 of the larger corporations in the country have endorsed this plan. I would thank Representative Bell and my Quaker friend, Representative Olson, and ask the House to adopt the Governor's specific recommendation for change."
- Speaker Daniels: "The question is, "Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2588 by adoption of the Amendment?". All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Getty, how do you want to vote?"

Getty: "My... My speaker button was not working, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "That's a sign of things to come, Sir."

Getty: "I wanted to...Thank you. I... You'd be surprised. I want to explain my 'present' vote. I think that this is a case, one of several, where the Governor has exceeded his authority under Article IV, Section 9(e) of the Illinois Constitution. While this may not be as clearly a violation of that authority, it still does raise a serious question, and I think that there is practically a hundred percent

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

guarantee that the issue of exceeding his authority in the amendatory veto will be raised and will be litigated. I, for one, do not feel that it does meet those criteria and; therefore, without expressing my position on the merits on the excess by the Governor, I will register a 'present' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of us that supported the original concept in 2588 are quite dismayed with the Governor's amendatory veto, especially those of us that Iowa Beef, for example, had options on property in Bureau and Lee Counties. We fought very vigorously for the incentive to bring Iowa Beef into Illinois. At this time, it is my understanding, through Representative Myron Olson of Lee County, that the company in question, which was of great concern to those of us in the area, has now submitted their recommendation to us. And, through Representative Olson, they have asked that the Legislators from those districts involved do support this compromise. Even though we have reservations, I will cast my vote in accordance with economic provisions from my district, and I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Being none, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this Motion, there are 139 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 17 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2588 by adoption of the Amendment. Supplemental Calendar #1, Amendatory Veto Motions, House Bill 2485, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

2485. Really simply, this Bill is the Bill on the state multiplier. As many of us know - and some of us refer to it as trying to put local taxes back into the local control. During some of the summer months, some of have heard consideration concerning this proposal, talking to some of the local taxing assessors and districts. Certainly, the local assessors have been totally willing to a fair market value of their properties which assess at they're intended to be doing. This certainly allows the multiplier to be negated, in effect, so that we actually make it in a local level. There are certainly fears of some taxing districts that they would lose their tax base allowing the state to come in and put additional multiplier on. Many of us here know that the state does not receive any of the funds, or any state or any state revenues from the state multiplier or the state real estate taxes. So really, this is a local issue by local people. The fears of the school districts and the local taxing districts is not to eliminate the state multiplier, but really their fear that the local assessing officials will not really do their job. As we know, we have a procedure where the assessors will assess at the 33 1/3 level; and, if in fact they do not, we can have our county boards have the Board of Review put a township multiplier to bring it up to that very level. By bringing it up to the 33 1/3, eliminating any state multiplier, local taxing districts lose no money whatsoever. They receive, and there's no tax increase to local taxpayers. And what it really does is make it a fairer way of assessing, because sometimes we find, in townships, some townships having 10, 15, 20 percent differential than a neighboring township in the same county. Well, multiplier only compounds those inequities. So, there is a

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

vehicle and a mechanism already in the statutes that would correct any inequities and bring the assessments up to the value_ One point I think is also important that school districts have asked me is about the hold-harmless clause in there so that they would not suffer, perhaps, a major impact if, in fact, the local assessors were to do that. And that is in the Governor's proposal, to allow the '81 equalized assessed valuation to be the level and lower than that in *82. So, we do have that provision still in here. You know, it's interesting also to see that the question appeared on several ballots for local referendum questions about how the voters felt about eliminating the state multiplier. It was interesting see that 63 - 64 some percent in Cook County, City of Chicago, other areas that had it, the voters supported eliminating this type of unfair tax. And I really think, and I think you have to agree that to have local taxing districts anticipate for balloon spending, looking for what and trying to second guess what a state multiplier would be, is not the responsible way to be levying and taxing our taxing ... our residents. Certainly, this is a meaningful tax reform proposal. I think it merits your affirmative vote, and I do ask for you to adopt the Governor's recommendations."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Adams,

Representative McClain. Excuse me. Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I again would call to the electricians attention the fact that my light apparently has some defect in it. It keeps going out. I don't know whether the Speaker has any control over that or not. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, at this time I move that the Speaker, the House, declare the Governor's amendatory veto to House

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Bill 2485 not in order as a clear violation of the powers delegated the Governor pursuant to Article IV, Section 9(e) of the Illinois Constitution. The Governor's amendatory veto should be ruled out of order, because Article IV. Section 9 (e) sets forth the provisions pursuant to Governor amendatorily veto a Bill. can provisions are that the Governor may return a Bill together with specific recommendations for change to the which it originated. The Bill shall be considered in the same manner as a vetoed Bill. but the specific recommendations may be accepted by a record vote of a majority of the Members elected. Such Bills presented again to the Governor; and, if he certifies that such acceptance conforms to his specific recommendations, the Bill shall become law. If he does not so certify, he shall return it as a vetoed Bill to the House in which originated. Recent caselaw interpretive provisions clearly indicates that the Governor's authority amendatory veto is limited. Applying the standards set forth in those cases, it must be concluded that the amendatory veto of House Bill 2485 is not authorized by Article IV, Section 9(e) and should be ruled out of order. In the case of City of Canton versus Crouch, Illinois - 154, the Illinois Supreme Court delineated the scope of the Governor's amendatory veto powers. T quote from 'It is clear that the power that case. encompasses more than mere proofreading to correct technical errors. It, therefore, becomes a question of guided discretion to judge whether the changes are less than fundamental alterations but more than technical corrections. The changes must be intended to improve the Bill in a material way, yet - and I emphasize - not to alter its essential purpose and intent. The changes must

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

constitute minor enhancements - minor enhancements which speak to the clarity, fairness and practical requirements of the Act. The Governor's amendatory veto to House Bill 2485 clearly alters the essential purpose and intent of the original Bill. House Bill 2485, as passed by the Legislature, was intended to provide for certain appeals in decisions relating to equalization assessments to the Property Tax Appeal Board. The catastrophic shift in purpose is clear in light of the effect of this Bill a revenue loss... (mic malfunction)... a revenue amended: loss of millions of dollars. Moreover, this overhaul House Bill 2485 is not a minor enhancement, as the caselaw requires, but represents a fundamental alteration of the The Governor's amendatory veto inserts a original Bill. completely new and important Section; that is, the Governor's multiplier reform whose sole connection to the original Bill is that it also constitutes an Amend... (mic malfunction) ... to the Revenue Act. In further cases, the court has also ruled that a Governor's amendatory veto was proper where it contained no change in the fundamental purpose of the legislation, nor contains no changes that are so substantial, so expansive as to render his use of the veto power... (mic malfunction)... violative of Section 9 (e) of Article IV. Mr. Speaker, I certainly think that there's something seriously wrong with the electronics here. I think I'm entitled to address the probably the most important issue..."

Speaker Daniels: "Why don't you move over to Representative Madigan's microphone? Something appears to be wrong with yours. It goes out here. So, why don't you move over one desk? Is that alright, Sir?"

Getty: "I'll stay here for the present. We'll see if we can keep it on. Maybe the electrician could personally watch it."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Speaker Daniels: "Keep an eye on Representative Getty's electrical wiring. Don't take your eye off of it."

Getty: "Not only does the Governor's amendatory veto to House 2485 run counter to the Illinois Supreme Court's holding with regard to the scope of his power pursuant Article IV, Section 9(e); but, in addition, it violates the clear intent of that pro... (mic malfunction)... drafters. In discussing this provision, the members of the 1970 Constitutional Convention emphasized that the purpose of amendatory veto provisions was to make technical non-substantive changes to a Bill. This purpose was plainly articulated by the provision's sponsor, quote. *It's purpose is to enable the Governor to have an alternative to vetoing a Bill where there might be some technical flav involved in it, which by the Bills modification might become acceptable to the Governor. That's from ConCon Daily Transcripts, 1338_ The page Governor's amendatory veto to House 2485 Bill is substantive in nature. Its purpose is radical. significant change from the Bill as it passed the General As a consequence, it constitutes flagrant Assembly. rejection of the drafter's intent with regard to Article IV, Section 9 (e) -In construing the scope of the Governor's powers under this Section, constitutional experts Robert Helman and Wayne Whaler have noted that, quote, at the very least the amendatory veto must be limited to the subject matter of the Bill', end quote. This subject-matter limitation is completely disregarded in the Governor's amendatory veto of the House Bill 2485. The original Bill, as noted previously, concerned the procedures for appeals from the Property Tax Board. The amendatory veto inserts an unrelated Section; that is, multiplier proposal. In conclusion, the Governor's

- 140th Legislative Day November 18, 1982 amendatory veto to House Bill 2485 should be ruled out of order since: 1) it exceeds the scope of the Governor's auth... (mic malfunction)... according to the standards set forth in the Illinois Su... by the Illinois Supreme Court; it violates the intent of the provisions as delineated by the drafters of the Constitution; 3) it falls outside the subject-matter limitation recognized by constitutional Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for those scholars. reasons, I ask that the Speaker now declare that the amendatory veto is out of order as failing to meet the
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, your Motion to declare the Governor's action out of order is, in itself, out of order and improper. But, treating that as a point of order, bringing the attention of that to the Body, the Chair specifically rules that your point is not well taken, and the Governor did not exceed his authority. Purther discussion? Representative Getty."

constitutional standards of Article IV, Section 9(e)."

- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, at this time, I will then dissent and protest the ruling of the Chair. I will ask that other Members join me in dissenting and protesting and ask leave to file a formal written dissent and protest."
- Speaker Daniels: "It's within your right, Sir. Any Members joining? Representative Pierce joins. Representative Getty, Representative Jaffe. *Democrat Organization of Chicago! joining altogether, right? is Representative Oh, downstaters, too. Okay. Your dissent will Greiman. be so noted and will be filed, Sir. Representative Telcser."
- Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we could dispense quite readily with the distinguished Gentleman from Cook's specious legal argument regarding the propriety of the Governor's amendatory veto in connection

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

with House Bill 2485. I think that really begs the question which all of us know is at hand, and that is the question of excessive real estate taxes. There is not a single campaign which I have been in for many, many years, and which I dare say every Member has been in, in which the question of excessive real estate taxes is not one of the central themes in anyone's campaign. Everyone in this chamber knows that this fall, when the next periods tax bills come due, the multiplier will be a scapegoat again. I know that every Member here today who took part in the November campaign remember last summer when many Members, particularly on the other side of the aisle, charged that the Governor was responsible for high real estate taxes because of the multiplier. There are people sitting in this chamber today, on both sides of the who were shocked at the election results because one or two issues defeated them. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I say to you that the question of excessive real estate taxes is one of those issues that could have a dramatic effect next time around. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also think it's about time that local officials become accountable for what they're doing. After all, that's the criticism we received during the course of the campaign. The Governor's amendatory veto, in connection with House Bill 2485, is once and for all our opportunity to be accountable and to make those officials who spend and assess our property and spend their tax money accountable. A vote to adopt the Governor's amendatory veto is a responsible vote. It's a vote which will once and for all set aside that scapegoat, multiplier, which every time tax bills come due winds up being the subject of discussion. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I urge every Member to vote 'yes' so

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

that we may adopt the Governor's amendatory veto in connection with House Bill 2485."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, contrary to the Majority Leader, I stand before you and I ask you to please not accept the amendatory veto of the Governor. I'd like to say two reasons for that. One is. the abolishment of multiplier is probably a good idea, but this way of doing it is poor management. This way of doing it permits the multiplier to stay in existence for multi-county districts. like, let's take downstate, we have multi-county So community college districts. The Governor and the Department of Revenue will be retaining the multiplier. So, by retaining the multiplier and the appeal for that multiplier, your local school systems and local taxing districts will be held up from putting out their tax bills and, thereby, have to take out anticipation warrants. So, in abolishing, sort of abolishing the multiplier in this cause, what you're really doing is causing havoc on your local governments, and you're not getting out the tax bills as fast as you think you are. The second reason is, I don't believe the Gentleman wanted to hurt people; with the way this is being done - I'll just give my own Quincy school system. The Quincy school system will lose 1.4 million dollars of the some 5 million that they receive from the State of Illinois and some 13 million from local governments. So, what that means to them is a tremendous hurting of kids and staff in that Quincy school system, and I think all of us know that all of our school systems; Chicago, suburbia and downstate, will be tremendously hurt by this piece of legislation. If you want to abolish the multiplier, let's do it and have a target date for all

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

multipliers for January 1, 1986 or '87, and let's cut it off and let everybody plan for it, manage properly for it and prepare for it. Let's not do it now so that we have so many people being hurt and not getting the job done that so many of us and candidates throughout the state said they were in favor of. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson."

"Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I dare say Johnson: aren't over five or ten Members of this chamber who didn't run in primaries and general elections last year based on a number of premises. One of them is and was that the real estate property tax system in Illinois is one of the most unfair, oppressive systems of taxation that we have. Another one is that the multiplier has been applied... in an arbitrary and capricious manner in a number of cases, at least, either ought to be reformed it. or eliminated. Another one is that we ought to have local control; that individuals ought to be...serve at a local level of government, whether it's assessment officials or are in the best position to be.. (mic otherwise, malfunction) ... their constituents properly. Another that local officials and state officials ought to be accountable for what they do. This Bill, with the meets every one of those objectives, and amendatory veto, it goes a long ways towards reform of a horribly unfair and oppressive system of taxation. Nobody can say that the Governor sprung this on us. Back in last January or at least...a year before we started full deliberative Sessions here, he presented this Bill in almost exactly this for debate, for editorial comment and otherwise. And he's simply asking us now to address ourselves to a problem that should have been addressed many, many years ago - hasn't. There may be some minor first-year effects caused by this

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Bill, but the long-run effects on good government in this state and real equitable property taxation are so much greater than any of the drawbacks that I think its enactment is an absolute necessity. ... (mic malfunction)... 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

McPike: "Sir, could you tell the Assembly how the multiplier for a given county is figured by the Department?"

Klemm: "You mean presently? They receive the sales ratio studies from every transaction, and they determine the value of what the assessor has assessed and what the actual sales have determined."

McPike: "Is that for one year, or two years or what?"

Klemm: "It's a three-year average."

McPike: "It's a three-year average. In periods of inflation or deflation, the law requires right now that all property be assessed once every four years. In Cook County its by quadrants. In downstate it can be by townships or whatever, but it's once every four years. So that, in any period of inflating property values or deflating property values, the multiplier would change for that township every year. Is that correct?"

Klenm: "Well..."

McPike: "I'm sorry. The sales ratio value would change for that township every year, unless the assessor came back in and re-assessed every year. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "Well, not necessarily, but the assessor can assess every year if they wish to. They must assess once... at least every four years, as you know."

McPike: "So, the solution then, from your point of view, would be to have the assessor re-assess every parcel of property

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

every year, unless we had no inflation whatsoever, a zero rate of inflation or deflation. Is that... Would that be your answer then?"

Klemm: "That certainly would be one approach."

McPike: "That would be one answer. Your other suggestion was that the... in downstate counties, the supervisor of assessments could issue township multipliers to... to ensure then that the state multiplier for the county would be 1.0. How would you do that in Cook County?

Klemm: "Well... I ... You don't have a Board of Review as we have it in ours, but you have the same body by the county board.

And you can assess equalization by your townships within Cook County, and that's by your township people."

McPike: "Well, what I asked was, does Cook County, does the Board of Appeals in Cook County have the authority to issue township multipliers?"

Klemm: "As far as I know, they do."

McPike: "No, they do not. That's not correct. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Sir."

McPike: "We are left then, by the suggestions of the Sponsor of this proposal, then with a number οf very silly alternatives. Number one, in order to avoid the multiplier changing every year, we can tell the assessor to re-assess every parcel of land in every township and every county in State of Illinois, which we know is physically impossible to do unless we double, or triple or, actually, unless we quadruple the staff of the ... of the assessor's office throughout Illinois. So, that's the first silly proposal. The second silly proposal is that we can somehow do this in Cook County, which is against the law; that we can issue township multipliers and prevent the multiplier from changing every year, which is against the law. So,

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

that's the second silly proposal. The third silly proposal is that this isn't going to cost school districts anything, and actually it's the State of Illinois that's responsible high property taxes. Well, the actual truth of the matter is this, is that property taxes are used for police protection, for fire protection and to educate our children in the State of Illinois. And if you want to change taxes, then you should address yourself to how you're going to fund those issues. You should not pretend, at level, that we are simply going to change the way the multiplier affects assessment levels and, thereby, we're going to continue to fund education, or fund police or fund fire protection. If you're serious about any of these proposals, you will come to the people and say that we have a responsibility to educate our children, and we're going We're going to reduce your property taxes and raise your income taxes. We have a responsibility to provide police and fire protection, and we're going to do it in a responsible manner. But, to come before this Assembly or before the people in the State of Illinois and say that we're going to provide services to you at no cost - in effect, that there is a free lunch - it's a complete and deliberate fraud. And that's what this deception is, a fraud on the people of Illinois, a fraud that will only hurt every school district and every local taxing district in the state, and I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't believe what I hear on the floor of the House today.

Just a few short weeks back, every radio station, every television station and every Chicago daily newspaper had the Chairman of the Democratic Party, the Chairman of the Democratic Party and a big mover and shaker of the

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Democratic Party, the Assessor himself, circulating petitions asking for this. They were successful in getting it on the ballot, and the people of Cook County gave them a resounding answer to what should be done here today. And everyone, both sides of the aisle, if they want to be responsive to the people in their district, just take a look at the vote that we had in Cook County on this issue."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you know, contrary to the prior pious pleadings of the Majority Leader and the Assistant Majority Leader, I would say a vote for this Bill is probably the most irresponsible vote that you will cast this week. Let's face it. I mean, this has been a phony political gimnick from its very beginning to the very end. Let us face the...the reality that this amendatory veto really exceeds the constitutional limitations as laid down in all the court cases; and, in all probability if we vote on this thing, it will knocked out by the courts. You know, this is really the first st...step to kill public education in the State of Illinois. I don't think that we ought to start playing politics with kids' educations, and that's exactly what we're doing here today. I mean, this may have elected Jim Thompson Governor, but it is a most irresponsible way to be elected Governor; and, if he were really a substance, I would think that he would rather lose than to take out his win on the kids of this particular state. think it's an irresponsible vote, and we should all vote 'no' on this particular Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Hastert: "I wanted to clarify a couple of questions that I have

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

in my mind. First of all, this Bill is, in fact, the multiplier/divider Bill. Is that correct, Sir?"

Klemm: "I...I didn't hear you. Mul...what?"

Hastert: "This is, in fact, if you have a multiplier, you also have a divider on your levies. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "Oh, yes. Yes."

Hastert: "Second point, counties have the option of putting on township multipliers, rather than accepting a state multiplier. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "Well, they have the option of adding a township multiplier which would tend to bring it up, which would lessen the state multiplier or eliminate it completely."

Hastert: "Or eliminate it."

Klemm: "But, they don't have a say of saying that just because they add a township multiplier of one-tenth of one percent that they would not still get a state multiplier."

Hastert: "Then it's... Going through this legislation and then through the Governor's amendatory veto of it, nowhere do I see that that affects township multipliers. It only affects the state multipliers. Is this correct?"

Klemm: "That is correct."

Hastert: "If a county Board of Review chooses to put on a township multiplier then, as many, many counties throughout this state do, those counties that have township multipliers and, hence, those school districts and all taxing bodies who have township multipliers, are not affected, basically, by this legislation. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "Yes, that is correct."

Hastert: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Proceed."

Hastert: "One of the issues that is before this General Assembly and has been before the General Assembly for this past

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Session is to bring some integrity into the property tax system that we have in the State of Illinois. I think you'll probably agree with me that one of the problems that have is people don't understand the system. complex system and then, when you start to integrate it into the educational system, it's even more complex. is a small step to start to bring some integrity into the system. It's a small step, if we believe in local governments, to put local governments in a position they can begin to recitify the problems and inequities that are in county and township assessments. I think it's good legislation. I think it's a first step, one of many more steps that we have to take, and I urge your positive consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen \mathbf{of} the House. Representative Getty has spoken about the constitutional problems with regard to what the Governor has done He has spoken about the fact that Article IV, Section 9(e) does not really give the Governor the power to put new Bills in the hopper, in effect, and that it is, therefore, violative of the Constitution. But, I want to talk about the basic unfairness that caused the drafters of the Constitution to put this in. The new Constitution provides that any Bill that is introduced must be posted and that people have a right to be heard. When House Bill 2485 was in the hopper, there was nothing in it about the effect on freeze...on the multiplier, about eliminating the There was no opportunity for school districts multiplier. to come in and be heard on the issue. There was no opportunity for newspapers to come in on the subject or radio or television stations to come in. There was no opportunity for witnesses to come in and be heard on

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

views, whether pro or con. A11 of a sudden now, the Governor, by simply the stroke of his pen in amendatory veto, has put a Bill before us without an opportunity for any Committee to hear this matter, for any witness to be heard. And I would assert that there is something more important than just the issue of It is the issue of basic fairness, and this basic fairness has been eroded by what the Governor done here. And whether one is for or against the right of taxing bodies and their position on this matter, every Member of this floor ought to be in favor of the right of every citizen and every group in this state to be heard when legislation is introduced that will drastically affect The only way, really, that this can be vindicated is to vote against the Governor's misuse of the amendatory veto, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, are you seeking recognition again, Sir?"

Getty: är. Speaker. I raise another point of order, and that again refers to Article IV. Section 9. This is similar to the point that I raised in Representative McMaster's Bill; however, I think there's a significant difference. The Governor's veto message contains a Section which appears on page 9 of the veto message. as follows: *Section 2. This amendatory Act takes effect upon its becoming a law and shall first be applicable to the comp...computation and extension of 1982 taxes due and 1983. I have searched Representative Klemm's payable Motion, and that does not appear in Representative Klemm's Motion. I suggest that if Representative Klemm's Motion were to prevail that this would not conform to the requirements of Article IV, Section 9 in that the Governor would then...would not then be able to certify that such

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

acceptance conforms to his specific recommendations, and the Bill could not become law. I'd like to make the point that this is significantly different from Representative In Representative McMaster's case, McMaster's case. were told that the Governor's Office had agreed to accept it; that it was a non-controversial issue. On that, I raised the point, notwithstanding, that there was a serious question as to whether it would conform and whether the Governor could certify it. In this case, we have a completely different matter. We have probably one of the most controversial issues to come before this House. He cannot pass it off as being something that will be easily disposed of because nobody will raise an issue. matter of fact, we are certain that there will be a challenge to this. We know there will, and if we adopt Motion that does not conform to the Governor's amendatory veto, we are then put in the posture of guaranteeing doubt and uncertainty in addition to the issue which I previously raised, further doubt and uncertainty because the Motion is defective. The Governor can't properly certify it, and I would therefore ask that the Chair rule that, because of the importance of this issue, that Representative Klemm's Motion could not conform, does not conform the amendatory veto message, and the Governor would not be able to certify it as conforming and rule it out of order."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Getty, on your point, I've discussed the same with the Parliamentarian, and he advises me that the Constitution provides only the Governor can determine whether or not these changes are consistent with his specific recommendations, and neither the Speaker nor any other Member can so rule on that subject. And, therefore, we find your point not in order. Representative Getty."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Getty: "I would, in accordance with the ruling of the Chair, I would then register my dissent and protest, ask that other Members join me in that and ask leave to file my written dissent and protest, articulating the argument that I set forth."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Members joining Representative Getty?

Representative Jaffe, Pierce, Madigan, Bullock, Loftus
joins in Representative Getty's objections, and you're

within your right, Sir. And the dissent, written dissent,

will so be filed. Further discussion? Representative

Ewing."

Ewing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the We have heard a great deal today about this Bill. Most of the opposition, though, deals with the fact that it was sent here on an amendatory veto, not with the real issue, and I would like, very quickly, to address that real issue. First of all, as long as local assessing officials the county boards and their subordinate committees who assign township multipliers do their job, there will be loss of revenue to local government. We will have a multiplier only for distribution of school aid. The problem will come in if local officials choose not to do their job and assess 33 1/3 or, in the alternative, assign township multipliers. Now, it has gone on long enough that local taxpayers are told that it's our fault; that we raised their taxes, that the Department of Revenue put the multiplier on them. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, you all know that we don't do that. We only try and make the tax base fair. This puts the responsibility back with those elected officials who should be assessing their property at the right level, who should be assigning the township multipliers and takes it off our back. Let's this job done. Let's get started with reforming the

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

property tax system. Let's vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he'll yield."

Keane: "Will the Department of Revenue continue to calculate the multiplier?"

When want the fairness between overlapping tax districts and also for the school state aid formula, which they intend to continue. There is no attempt here to try to have one county, perhaps, try to get a bonanza on their state aid for their schools and give more su...support at the expense of other taxing districts. So, therefore, those are the safeguards that are built in there."

Keane: "Will the multiplier be determined by using the multi...will the rates be, in any way, affected by the Department of Revenue multiplier as provided to the county clerk? Let me give you an example. If I am a local taxing district and my rate is three dollars and the multiplier, as determined by the Department of Revenue, my multiplier is 2.0, will the county clerk, under the Governor's amendatory veto provisions, not have to set my rate at a maximum of 150?"

Klemm: "Well..."

Keane: "I think you'd better read the Bill. You'll find that the...we do not, we do not do away with the application of the multiplier. It is actually applied against the local rates. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "That's right, but it does not anywhere change the tax rate, and I don't know what if we're talking about..."

Keane: "Well, when you multiply your tax rate, your maximum tax rate as it is extended, you divide it by your multiplier.

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

If it's in excess of 1.0, you are reducing the rate."

Klemm: "If...on taking the assessed valuation, but the multiplier is only on the assessed valuation to be taxed at the maximum tax rate but that's..."

Keane: "And so, this is going to have, the Governor's Bill is going to have a direct impact on the maximum rate available."

Klemm: "No."

Keane: "It certainly will. You better read your Amendment. This has a direct, and I don't think anyone...too many people realize this. This Bill, as it is now written, can reduce the tax rate. It will take your rate down. That's the total issue that's involved here."

Klemm: "They still in...they still use our maximum tax rate when they extend it."

Reane: "All right. My maximum tax rate is three dollars. I extend it. I want my maximum tax rate. If the Department of Revenue says that the multiplier for that county is two, then my maximum becomes \$1.50."

Klemm: "Yes, your local rate could lower it because of that, yeah."

Keane: "Yeah, so the multiplier has not...we are not abolishing the multiplier. If any of you politically have told your constituents that you are going to vote for the abolition of the multiplier, you are not doing it. The multiplier will be used, and it will be used against your rates. We will not use it to take your total levy and use it to multiply your total levy to kick it up. What it's going to be done...What will be done is that it will be levied against your rates. Another question for the Sponsor. How long do you think it would take to re-assess a million, four...1,400,000 parcels of real estate?"

Klemm: "I wouldn't know."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Keane: "Well, this..."

Klemm: "I...I know...I know with the computers that the assessors now have that they didn't have before that it's not quite as difficult if you're talking about inflationary factors to be used in the assessment..."

Keane: "They're having difficulty because of the fact that county government is getting too much to do at once, every four years. According to your Bill...or your Amendment, the whole state would have to be reassessed in one year. Is that correct? We're talking about 2.8 billion parcels of real estate. Almost...3,000,000, I'm sorry. We have almost 3,000,000 parcels of real estate that would have to be reassessed. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "Well, no, because, you know, there's counties around my area that don't even have the state multiplier. It's a negative zero factor. They do not assess it every year. It is being done properly by the township multipliers being added, and I'm talking about Lake County and Kane County that has like a .05 state multiplier. So, the counties are doing..."

Keane: "Then the multiplier..."

Klemm: "Allow me to finish the question."

Keane: "Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead."

Klemm: "So, apparently counties can do it. The assessors don't have to go every year, as you're suggesting they are. But they have the right to do it, and they can do it if you feel they need to and the assessor feels they want to do it, because the assessors have suggested that they are willing to do their job for fair and equitable assessments. The assessor in Cook County has said that very thing, so apparently it doesn't worry them and it doesn't worry me."

Keane: "If I added...If I am an assessor and my county assessment is 1.5 and I cannot reassess the full county within the

- 140th Legislative Day

 given year, what's going to happen is that all of the
 non-home-rule units in that county will be cut by
 one-third. Is that correct, if they're at their maximum
 level?"
- Klemm: "You mean, if the townships and the assessors don't assess..."
- Keane: "No, if the units...if the units of local government are at their maximum level, the ones that are not home-rule units, and they are...they are...the multiplier is brought out at 1.5, if I do not reduce...if I do not assess that whole county in that year, I will lose...or my units of local government, through no fault of their own, will be cut by one-third. Is that correct?"
- Klemm: "Well, apparently, the fixed rate districts would be eliminated by the plan, but let me also suggest that it's just..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Do you wish to address the Bill, Sir?"
- Keane: "No, I'd like to ask a few more questions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, would you bring your questions to a close, and we'll give you time to address the Bill if you'd prefer."
- Keane: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very important

 Bill. I think other speakers have indicated that this is

 also a complicated Bill..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, your ten...your ten minutes is approaching, but you proceed, Sir."
- Keane: "Thank you. If I'm a sc...If I'm the superintendent of a school district and my...in my county I'm a non-home-rule unit in my county..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Excuse me for interrupting. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would you please be in your seats? Please bring order and listen to the discussion.

 Doorkeeper, would you please remove those people not

140th Legislative Day

authorized to be on the floor. Mr. Doorkeeper, please,
remove lobbyists and those people that are not authorized
to be on the floor."

Keane: "Thank you. If I am a school superintendent and my county has had a 1.5 multiplier..."

Speaker Daniels: "Center aisle, here, Mr. Doorkeeper. Proceed."

Keane: "Thank you. If I am a school superintendent and my county has had a 1.5 multiplier and we have a bad assessor - we have assessors that don't have the capacity to go through their county and reassess in a year - and the Department of...I have...and I'm a school superintendent. I have absolutely nothing to do or no control over the assessor. If the assessor doesn't do his job, I'm going to lose one-third of my rate. Is that correct?"

Klemm: "Well, no...no. There are avenues that they can use.

They can file writs of mandamus against the ta...assessor.

Secondly, you know, a lot of people do not realize that the local assessor is an elected official that we're trying to support..."

Keane: "No, let's..."

Klemm: "And therefore, in addition to that, you still have the Board of Review to make adjustments, if they are in error. An assessor can also put a certificate...certification of error in to correct those deficiencies that he apparently, or she, has inadvertently made, because no assessor, I wouldn't think, unless you suggest otherwise, is effectively trying to not assess in a correct, fair amount. From our avenues to correct..."

Keane: "No, I have...I have a...I am the school superintendent.

The assessor may be totally unable, that they inca...incapable of reassessing a county that has arrived at its assessment level over a 50-year period. He may be completely in...incapable of reassessing that in a one-year

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

period. A writ of mandamus is fine, but then what we're talking about is court action, which could take two to five years. You're talking about me going out and taking tax anticipation warrants."

Klemm: "All right. What are...What are the problems..."

Keane: "But, basically what you're saying is is that there is no recourse except through the courts for..."

Klemm: "No, I didn't..."

Keane: "...some local official who may or may not be able to move the assessor to get an equitable assessment."

Klemm: "No, I didn't say all that, but certainly there are other avenues. You know, but the example you give is really some of the problems we're faced with. If you have an assessor right now who is not assessing a township correctly and the state and all the other townships in that county are, in fact, assessing properly, within reason, and the state puts in an equalized factor on there, what it has done is compounded the errors of that one township assessor that didn't do the job, that you alluded to. At least allowing the townships to come in and say that no longer will the state bail this out. This is a local tax issue. This is a local, by elected officials. They can resolve that. We can at least take care of that errant township assessor that you used in your example to bring his level up for fair and equitable taxes with all the townships within that county. I would think you would support that totally."

Keane: "Thank you, I'd be very happy to support any legislation you have that deals with making the assessment practice better, but I still don't think...I think you're taking the sins of the assessor and visiting them on the local officials. To the Bill, the Bill does not abolish the multiplier. It actually makes the multiplier more

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

It gives the Governor of this state, through important. the use of the multiplier which will still be propagated and it will still be averaged or divided into your tax rate of local units of government in your districts that are not home rule units, the Governor will actually, through the...through the multiplier, have a bigger impact on local It destroys the financial base of school districts and non-home-rule units of government who have already been especially school districts, by declining state aid. Now, what they can do is the Governor will go in and, not only cut state aid, but he can cut the school tax rate by the application of the multiplier to their base. The Bill...or the Amendment does nothing to correct the erroneous procedures in the classical...classically statistical methods that the Department of Revenue has used in determining the multiplier. There has been an ongoing argument by all assessing offici...by the great bulk assessing officials in the State of Illinois that the Department of Revenue fails to use...to take into account the new financing methods, the creative methods where that, if I have a 100,000 dollar house and I want to sell it to you, it would take 18 percent interest to buy it. I*11 kick the house prices up to 120,000 dollars, and I'll sell it to you for 10 percent. The Department of Revenue should take that 20,000 dollars and discount it as interest, and not as the basic cost. They have not been doing this in an adequate manner. Finally, although there are many, many more things that are wrong with this Amendment, it Bill...or the Amendment has a disaster...a disastrous effect on schools such as my...those in Cook from which I come. Because the tax rate there is County, 1.8, it would result in a 46 percent reduction in school base. That cannot be made up. No school...no

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

school district in Cook County cannot be made up without a severe structural change in the assessment system. I don't...I agree with some of the speakers that said we must do something about the multiplier. I have a Bill...I have filed a Hotion for a Bill, 1254. It is on the Calendar. My intentions are to move that Bill, to get it off the Calendar, to put it into a Conference Committee and ask that we, we as a body, go for a one-year freeze, put a cap on the multiplier for this year, put together some Committees and work out the problem, giving local units of government some time to adapt, to adjust and to realize that the multiplier will be phased out over a period of years. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous guestion."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Klemm to close."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Certainly there's been a great deal of rhetoric on this issue, and it's... I really am somewhat shocked at some of the things I heard; to suggest, as one speaker did, that high taxes are caused by multipliers. And I think everybody in this room really, with common sense, high taxes are caused by high spending. It has nothing to do with it. And if local officials, the same as us, our spending down, we wouldn't have such high taxes. And it's...it's enlightening to see that the fears of local taxing districts, and I might add, I served many years as a school board president. So, I am cognizant of their concerns, and have served many years in local government, as all of you have done. So, I'm as concerned as you, but it's the assumption or the perception that local assessors,

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

local elected officials, will not do their job, and I don't subscribe to that argument. I think they will, and I think they will for a couple of reasons. One is because local assessing officials throughout this state and at least in my area that I personally have contacted are willing and ready to do the job that we need, it's the whether assessors or, in fact, the Board of Review in the county. and I think also, here's a chance to substantiate what the voters themselves have indicated. Where put this question on the referendum and allowed the voters to determine what we should be doing, they have overwhelmingly said let's abolish and let's effectively eliminate the state multiplier. They have done that, and I think now's the time for us to cast that vote to determine and to show them that we really are sincere about tax reform. There's a lot more to do. I'm not saying that, but certainly this is a positive step. And to keep the state equalizer so that we have the overlapping districts and to preserve it, I think we're fair. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask for all to vote in ac...acceptance of the Governor's recommendations."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2588...258...2485 by adoption of the Amendment? .. in favor will signify by voting "aye", opposed by voting no. The voting's open. Explanation of vote. Representative Bell. Timer's on, Sir."

Bell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was the House Sponsor of 2485, and I want you to know that, if this amendatory veto is such a good idea — which I don't believe it is — on its own last spring in the Senate, it got nowhere, exactly where it should go today in

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

the House. And I hope you all have listened very carefully to what Representative Keane has said, and either vote 'no' or 'present'. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that some people who enjoy having a multiplier of one in their county have the false impression that this Bill will have no effect on the local taxing districts within their Nothing could be further from the truth. county. The reason that some counties have a multiplier of one is because they have finally seen the light and have imposed township multipliers that would have been a far solution for the Governor to take if he wanted to lead us out of the morass of poor assessment practices in some If he had done that, perhaps I could support counties. this legislation. But, in fact, what he has instead make it impossible for local governments to have local control of their own taxing system. If ⊮e fact, to give that authority to the local level, we should be rejecting this Bill, and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bowman. Timer's on, Sir."

Bowman: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to point out that there's no immediate effective date on this. That means this goes into effect next July 1. The hold-harmless language on page 4, I believe, should have been changed to advance the dates or actually to push back the dates into *83 and *84; because, otherwise, without an immediate effective date, there's no way that you can implement the hold-harmless provisions on page 4. So, if we adopt this legislation, there is hold-harmless. So, if you're voting fo this...to accept this language because you think there's a hold-harmless provision, I think you're kidding yourselves, because

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

there's not an immediate effective date on this Bill."

- Speaker Daniels: "Have all voted who wish? Further explanation of votes. Representative Greiman. Representative Loftus. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 89 'aye', 78 'no'. Hold it. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Could I have a verification of the Roll Call, please?"

 Speaker Daniels: "Lady's asked for a verification of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Klemm has asked for a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "May I be verified?"

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wikoff have leave to be verified? Representative Currie? Yes. Representative...All right. I'll keep track of them, if that's all right with you. Representative Wikoff, Representative Fawell and Hastert."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Beatty. DiPrima. Domico.

 Nash. Oblinger and Robbins."
- Speaker Daniels: "Will all Members please be in their seats and all those not entitled to the floor please retire to the gallery? Mr. Doorkeeper, please remove all those not entitled to the floor? Will the Members please cooperate, be in their seats. Proceed with a verification of the Affirmative Roll. What's the count now, Mr. Clerk? There are 89 'ayes' and 78 'nos'. Proceed."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Ackerman. Alstat.

 Barkhausen. Barnes. Bartulis. Bianco. Boucek. Bower.

 Capparelli. Collins. Conti."
- Speaker Daniels: "Excuse me. Representative Getty, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Getty: "Mr. Speaker, the Clerk, I think, is reading those names with unprecedented speed. I'd ask, on behalf of

- 140th Legislative Day

 Representative Currie, who is in the well trying to follow those names..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, Representative Currie ought to be at her chair in order to conduct a proper verification."
- Getty: "She'd like to stand up there in the podium..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Well, that's the first thing that's causing confusion up here, Sir, and so...and that is unprecedented as well, her being in the well."
- Getty: "Would you...Would you ask the Clerk, please, to slow down just slightly? He's doing an excellent job in all other respects."
- Speaker Daniels: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Deuchler. Donovan.

 Evan...Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Fawell. Findley.

 Virginia Frederick."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the rules ver...very clearly spell out that no Member can be in the Clerk's well during the operations of the House."
- Speaker Daniels: "I think she...I think she anticipated your ruling. As a matter of fact, she's accommodated your request. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Proceeding with the Poll of the Affirmative. Dwight Friedrich. Giglio. Grossi. Hallock. Hastert. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Karpiel. Kasper. Ji⊞ Kelley. Klemm. Kociolko. Koehler-Kosinski. Kustra. LaHood. Leinenweber. Leon. Loftus. Macdonald. Margalus. Mautino. Mays. McAuliffe. McAvoy. McBroom. McCormick. Ted Neyer. Roland Meyer. Hiller. Mulcahey. Neff. Nelson. Ozella. Peters. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Saltsman. Sandquist. Schraeder. Slape. Smith. Irv Smith. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele.

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Swanstrom. Tate. Telcser. Terzich.

Topinka. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. Watson.

Wikoff. Winchester. Woodyard. Zwick and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll.

Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. Representative Bartulis."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bartulis. He's in his chair."

Currie: "Representative Boucek."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Boucek is at his chair."

Currie: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Terzich. Gentleman in the chambers? Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich. Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Currie: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Grossi is at his chair."

Currie: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Margalus. He's in the aisle."

Currie: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McBroom is in his chair."

Currie: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Daniels: "Leon is in the center aisle."

Currie: "Representative McCormick."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McCormick is in his chair."

Currie: "Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Daniels: "Wikoff was verified, Ma*am."

Currie: "Oh, thank you. You're right. Representative Leon."

Speaker Daniels: "You already requested that one."

Currie: "Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. Representative Slape."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Slape. Representative Slape.

Is he out there? Is he here? I think he's right outside

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

the door. Is he out there? Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Gentleman in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Currie: "Representative Neff."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Neff is in his chair, as usual."

Currie: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Daniels: "McAuliffe. Roger McAuliffe is in his chair."

Currie: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Larry Stuffle is over here where he belongs."

Currie: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Daniels: "Ron Stearney. Representative Stearney. Representative Stearney. Is the Gentleman in the chambers?

How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Currie: "Representative Ozella."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Ozella. Representative Ozella.

I think he's with Terzich. Representative Ozella.

Gentleman in the chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Remove him."

Currie: "Representative Stanley."

Speaker Daniels: "Roger Stanely is in his chair."

Currie: "Representative Irv Smith."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Smith. Irv Smith, center aisle.

Further questions?"

Currie: "Representative Jack Davis."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jack Davis is in his chair."

Currie: "No more questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "No...Being no further questions, Representative

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Deuster, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is Representative Deuster recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Deuster: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Deuster from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Johnson: "Before I address the Chair, what is the count?"

Speaker Daniels: "Well, we...we're not quite finished with the call, Sir."

Johnson: "Well, how...how am I recorded on the roll?"

Speaker Daniels: "How is Representative Johnson recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Johnson: "I think I'll stay 'aye'."

Speaker: "Okay."

Currie: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I would ask..."

Speaker Daniels: "What purpose does Representative Piel arise?"

Piel: "How am I recorded, please?"

Speaker Daniels: "How's the Gentleman, Representative Piel, recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Piel: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Daniels: "Change Representative Piel from 'no' to 'aye'.

Return Representative Stearney to the Affirmative Roll.

Representative Dunn, Jack Dunn."

Dunn, Jack: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Daniels: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Dunn, Jack: "Change that to 'aye', please."

Speaker Daniels: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'.

Representative Barr, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?

Okay. Is it... On this question, there are 89 'aye', 75

140th Legislative Day

- November 18, 1982
- 'nos'. The Motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2485 by the adoption of the Amendment. Representative Deuster."
- Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote...vote that was just taken."
- Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman, Representative Deuster, has moved to reconsideration. Representative Tuerk moves that lies on the table."
- Tuerk: "I move that that lie on the table."
- Speaker Daniels: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion lies on the table.

 Total Veto Motions, House Bill 1120, Representative Preston. Total Veto Motions, page 2. Out of the record.

 House Bill 1241, Representative McClain. Total Veto Motions. Out of the record. Agreed Resolutions, Representative Conti."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1167, Giglio. 1170, Capparelli -1171, Terzich. 1172, Bullock. 1173, Topinka. et al. 1174, Yourell. 1175, Hannig. 1177, Chapman - et al. 1178, Catania. House Joint Resolution 114, Murphy -Hastert - Deuchler. House Joint Resolution 115, DiPrima et al. House Joint Resolution 116, DiPrima - et al. House Joint Resolution 117, DiPrima - et al. House Resolution 118, DiPrima - et al. House Joint Resolution 119, DiPrima - et al. House Joint Resolution 120, Fawell et al. House Joint Resolution 121, Hudson - et al. Joint Resolution 122, Hudson - et al. House Joint Resolution 123, Hudson - et al."
- Conti: "Turn me on. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1170, Capparelli and Madigan, congratulating Cornelius J. Collins, Associate Judge of

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Circuit Court of Cook County will retire from judiciary of the state on Illinois...of Illinois on December 5, 1982. House Resolution 1171, Terzich - Matijevich - et al, that Mildren Vikovic Sipich of 116 Elm Street, Chicago, Illinois will be celebrating her 80th birthday on November 22, 1982. House Resolution 1172, Norman LaHarry was recently selected by the Illinois Pharmaceutical Association to be the Illinois recipient of the "Bowl of Hygiene" of 1982. House Resolution 1720...1173 by Topinka. Richard Rosenow proclaimed Boys Club of Cicero Boy of the Year at the 25th annual awards night banquet attended by 250 boys. House 1174, that this House congratulates Resolution James Doherty and thanks him for his 25 years of outstanding service on behalf of the citizens of this state. Resolution 1175 by Hannig, that we extend our heartiest congratulations for an outstanding season to the 1982 South Central Conference champions, the Cavaliers of Carlinville High School. House Resolution 1177, Meyer - Chapman and Macdonald, that the Schaumburg High School Saxons captured the Illinois High School Association girls' cross country in Peoria on November 13, championship 1982. House Resolution 1178, the Mighty Macs of Mother McAuley High School completed a perfect 48 and nothing season with a victory over a fine Glenbard West team in the final match of Class AA state volleyball tournament championship. House Joint Resolution 114, where Curt Olson and Sam Sheagren were two of the 1982 graduates of East Senior High School of Aurora, Illinois were selected by the Illinois State Board of Education to receive "Those Who Excel" plaques. House Joint Resolution 115, DiPrima - et al, that the Congress of the United State is urged to take whatever public or forceful action is necessary to obtain the identity and and seek the release of our prisoners of war

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

and secure the fullest possible accounting of those still missing as a result of the Vietnam war, through our national or international public or private agencies. House Joint Resolution 116, DiPrima - et al, that Mrs. Plorence Taylor of Binghampton, New York was elected National President of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on August 19, House Joint Resolution 117, DiPrima - et al, that the Rhine Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 2729 of Chicago received its charter on October 29, 1932 and has served the veterans of Southwest Chicago community for 50 years. House Joint Resolution 118, DiPrima - et al, that we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to establish National Family Week during the Thanksgiving holiday week as an annual observance week. House Joint Resolution 119, DiPrima - et al, that Mrs. Jeanette L. Shapiro of Cypress, California was elected President of the National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. to serve during the 1982-83 term. House Joint Resolution congratulate Tricia Bach, an 18 year-old graduate of the Immaculate Conception High School in Elmhurst, Illinois, who was selected as the 1983 Miss Illinois Teen All America and will reign as the holder of that title during 1983. House Joint Resolution 121, Hudson - Hastert - Murphy, that the Naval Sea Cadet Corps observed its 20th anniversary on 10th of September, 1982. House Joint Resolution 122, Hus...Hudson - Hastert - Murphy. It has come to the attention of this House that Sherman G. Alexander, a captain in the U.S. Navy has successfully completed a two-year term of duty as commanding officer. House Joint Resolution 123, Hudson - Hastert - Murphy - DiPrima - et al. On December...On November 10, 1982, in keeping with the November 1, 1921 direction of John A. Lejeune -

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Commandent of the Corps - the United States Marine Corps observed its 207th anniversary. House Joint Resolution 1167, whereas Zilda...this is House Resolution, correction. House Resolution 1167 by Giglio. Exilda Laura Courier Derusha of Esca... Escanaba, Michigan will be celebrating her 90th birthday on November 23, 1982. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption Agreed House Joint Resolutions and House Resolutions."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. For purpose of an introduction, Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are bumper strips which Representative C. L. McCormick has distributed for a long time. It says, 'Things are beautiful in Southern Illinois'. I think the proof of that is here today. It is my distinct pleasure to present to you Miss Illinois for 1982, who is a resident of Mount Carmel, Illinois in my legislative district, Jaleigh Jeffers. Jaleigh."

Jaleigh Jeffers: "Thank you. Thank you. It's an honor for me to be here with you today and to speak before you. It's also a great honor for me to be able to represent the state that I was born and been raised in. I am a native of Southern Illinois, and I...it's a great honor to be involved in the Miss America pageant system. As you know, the Miss America pageant is involved and very dedicated to promotion of higher education in our society. It's the largest scholarship organization in the country for women, and this year about two million dollars is given away. And I'm sure that you all also realize the importance of education in our society. I am a senior at Southern

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Illinois University at Carbondale and will graduate with an accounting degree next fall from there, and I've come to realize this year how important my college education is going to be to me. One of the pleasures of being Miss Illinois has been the opportunity for a girl from the southern part of the state to also get to many of the northern parts and especially to Chicago and become more familiar with it. And I realize now the hard job that you all have in trying to represent the entire state in its diversification. I commend you for that. It's an honor to be here with you today. I hope I get the opportunity to meet many of you and thank you all for your attention."

Bower: "Thank you, Jaleigh. With her today in Springfield are here parents, Miss...Bryant and Mary Lou Jeffers. Not only is she a beautiful product of Southern Illinois, she also is going to my alma mater. She is, as I indicated, from Mount Carmel, district represented by Representative Brummer, Representative Robbins, Senator Bruce and myself, and I believe at this time that the Clerk has a Resolution to read, if he would read it, please."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Joint Resolution 111 sponsored by Bower, Brummer and Robbins. Whereas, Jaleigh Jeffers of Mount Carmel was born on October 16, 1960 — the daughter of Bryant and Mary Lou Jeffers; whereas, Ms. Jeffers graduated from Mount Carmel High School where her activities included serving as president of the senior class, working as the editor of the school yearbook, Quill and Scroll and cheerleading; whereas, despite here heavy extracurricular schedule in high school, Ms. Jeffers compiled an exemplary academic record, finishing in the top one percent of her class and being chosen as a member of the National Honor Society and an Illinois State Scholar — accomplishments which, together with her pursuits, earned her a place in

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Who's Who in American High Schools; and whereas, from high school, Ms. Jeffers went on two years to study at Wabash Valley College where she earned a dean's list every semester, belonging to the honorary accounting fraternity, Beta Alpha Psi, was chosen as Presidential Scholar and, was named Outstanding Young Woman of America: whereas, after Wabash Valley College, Ms. Jeffers enrolled college of business at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale where she is majoring in accounting and has been a member of the College of Business Student Council and a consistent member of the dean's list and worked as an instructor's assistant in cost accounting; whereas, during spring of 1981, Ms. Jeffers, who is working toward a Certificate (sic Certified) Public Accountant's certificate, served as an internship of tax consultant with the prestigious firm of Arthur Anderson and Company; and whereas, when not occupied with professional or academic Ms. Jeffers has filled here space (sic - spare) interests. time with photography, skiing, swimming, teaching School and church bible training and continuing here 12-year study of piano; whereas, Ms. Jeffers' seemingly endless list of achievements of indicates a fervent desire to contribute as much as possible to and get as much out...as possible out of life, the causes of Members of this House to wholeheartedly endorse her having been chosen Miss Illinois for 1982; whereas, äs. Jeffers, today on November 18, 1982, was paid a call on the General Assembly: therefore, resolved by the Senate of the 82nd General Assembly, State of Illinois and the House concurring herein that the Senate and the House welcome Ms. Jaleigh Jeffers -Miss Illinois for 1982 - an individual who provides a sterling example of fi...of very finest qualities of Illinois' citizenry and whose representation in this state

140th Legislative Day

- November 18, 1982
- makes us extremely proud; and be it further resolved, that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution shall be presented to Ms. Jeffers as a formal token of our welcome and high regard for our very best wishes to her in all the years to follow."
- Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution's adopted. Representative Bower for another announcement."
- Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind all Members of the General Assembly they received an invitation to a reception, 4:30 to 7:30 this evening at Baur's Opera House. We would look forward to seeing you there. It is with Miss Illinois."
- Speaker Daniels: "Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of
 Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate
 Joint Resolution, an adoption of which I'm instructed to
 ask concurrence of the Representatives, to wit: Senate
 Joint Resolution 112, adopted by the Senate November 18,
 1982. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Daniels: "I want to point out the Secretary of Transportation, John Kramer is present in the House.

 Secretary Kramer, welcome. General Resolution."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1176 sponsored by Representative Christensen."
- Speaker Daniels: "Committee on Assignments. Motion on two Bills,
 Motion by Representative Cullerton to be recorded as voting
 'no' on House Bill 1971, and by Representative Sandquist to
 be recorded as 'yes' on House Bill 608. Are there any
 objections? Hearing no objections, Motions are adopted.
 Introduction, First Reading."

140th Legislative Day

- November 18, 1982
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2684, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First

 Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Death Resolution. Take that last Resolution out of the record. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker...Motion on Senate Bill 1248. This is the Reference Bureau Bill, which is the usual clean—up deal with no substantive changes. It's going to require an Amendment and require going back to the House, but this...these Amendments have been worked out by the Reference Bureau, and I can assure you they're not substantive and not controversial. It's just an attempt to clean up the statute. I...I assume there's no opposition."
- Speaker Daniels: "There any objections? Hearing none, Gentleman's Motion prevails. We'll use the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "I believe this now is on the Order of Second Reading.

 I just want to confirm that with the Clerk."
- Speaker Daniels: "That is correct, Sir."
- Friedrich: "Okay, I have an Amendment at the proper time that it's been down there. Whenever you get on that Order, I wanted to move it because it will have to go back to the Senate."
- Speaker Daniels: "Correct, Sir. Death Resolution. Hold it. All right. Back on the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bills.

 Senate Bill 1248, Representative Dwight Friedrich. Yep, that's right."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I have an Amendment which is actually the clean-up language, and I would like to move for its adoption with the understanding that the Minority would like to study this Amendment. If there's any problems with it, I will hold the Bill or make the necessary corrections

- 140th Legislative Day

 November 18, 1982

 that they require. With that, I move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any objections? Hearing no objections, Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading, Senate Bill 1248. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1248, a Bill for an Act to revise various Acts to resolve multiple Amendments or additions or correction of technical errors and patent errors and omissions and revise cross references and delete obsolete and duplicative provisions. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1, offered by Friedrich, Wikoff, amends Senate Bill 1248 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Priedrich has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is adopted. Third Reading, Senate Bill 1248. Death Resolution, former Member. Read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1148 by Representative Henry.
 Whereas, it is with great sorrow that the Members of this
 House learned of the untimely death of their former
 colleague, the Honorable Walter L. Shumpert, on Friday,
 October 29, 1982; and whereas, Alderman Shumpert was born
 in Marion, Arkansas on January 29, 1933 the son of the
 Reverend and Mrs. Robert Dayton (sic Drayden) Shumpert;
 and whereas, Alderman Shumpert, after receiving his high
 school education at Marion High School in Marion, Arkansas
 and Woodstock High School in Woodstock, Tennessee, attended
 Crane Junior College and the University of Chicago; and

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

whereas, Alderman Shumpert's community interest and affable style made him a natural for the world of politics - a world in which his accomplishments included, among others, positions of Deputy Sheriff of Cook County, Aldermanic Secretary for the late George W. Collins, Superintendent of Chicago's 24th Ward Bureau of Sanitation, Assistant General Superintendent of Chicago's Bureau ο£ Streets Sanitation, State Representative from the 21st Legislative District, Ward Committeeman from Chicago's 24th Ward Alderman from the 24th Ward; and whereas, among Alderman Shumpert's survivors are his wife, Eloise, and his children: Walter Jr., Arthur, David, James, Edward, Walter Carsons, Lori, Lisa and La Mia: and throughout...although saddened by his passing, this is proud to point out, as having been one of its Members, Walter L. Shumpert, a man who always fought the good fight, who always keeps the faith and who has known...and who now has finished his course; therefore be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 82nd General Assembly of State of Illinois, that this House salutes the memory of Alderman Shumpert and efforts that he directed toward improving the quality of life for citizens of this State: and be it further resolved, that a copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the family of the Honorable Walter L. Shumpert as a formal token of this House's admiration for him and a sense of loss his former colleagues feel for his passing."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Rouse, it's kind of hard to say anything about a person that you grew up with, a person that you entered local politics, a person that you worked 25 years with, a person that you never had an argument with, because he was the

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

type of gentleman that understood and listened to the people's choices, their opinions, which made him a very, very strong individual, because he was a quiet person, a kind person with a big heart. As you probably know that, Walter Shumpert is responsible for me being in the House of He was responsible for a lot of things Representatives. for the good of the people of the great West Side. coming Sunday, we will have the continuing services to the the 24th Ward: because we will poor and the aged in continue the senior citizens' dinner which we hope to feed at least 1,000 seniors. Those are the type of things that Walter Shumpert reminded me of and continued to do so even though he never had a big bank account. He never had He never had a lot of clothes, because he spent a cars. lot of money and time with those from my neighborhood who and handicapped and uneducated. And I • m DOOL fortunate that we had to live through a time when Walter Shumpert gave so much of himself and very, very few people even recognized it. But I can tell you, Gentlemen of the House, we've lost a brother and a son of a pastor who married the daughter of a reverend, who produced a son who is now Walter Shumpert, Jr., who is now a pastor, religious person that very, very few people knew. But I'll always remember Walter Shumpert as 'Shump', my friend that had the strength of a brother, because I had no brothers and sisters, and Alderman Shumpert stepped forward years ago, and he became my brother. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to add every Member of the House Representatives Cosponsor Death as a of this Resolution."

Speaker Daniels: "Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Representative Telcser for the adoption of the Resolution and Adjournment Resolution."

140th Legislative Day

November 18, 1982

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me simply add to what Representative Henry has said. I, along with many Members here today, had the honor and distinction of serving with this very fine Gentleman. He demonstrated over and over again the concerns he had for his constituency, for his ward and the people he represented and additionally for the great Party of which he was a Member. So, Mr. Speaker, I now move for the adoption of the Resolution and that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Daniels: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning. Death Resolution is adopted."

PAGE 1

NOVEMBER 18, 1982

HB-0394	MOTION	PAGE	.3
HB-0579	MOTION	PAGE	4
HB-0579	MOTION	PAGE	24
HB-0579	OTHER	PAGE	8
HB-0608	MOTION	PAGE	8
HB-1244	MOTION	PAGE	11
HB-1971	MOTION	PAGE	11
HB-2133	MOTION	PAGE	12
HB-2234	MOTION	PAGE	15
HB-2485	MOTION	PAGE	30
HB-2588	MOTION	PAGE	27
HB-2683	FIRST READING	PAGE	1
HB-2684	PIRST READING	PAGE	71
SB-1248	SECOND READING	PAGE	71
SB-1248	MOTION	PAGE	71
SJR-0111	ADOPTED	PAGE	70
SJR-0111	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	68

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER RYAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JOHN HIPPARD	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORT	PAGE	1
MESSAGE PROM SENATE	PAGE	2
RECESS	PAGE	3
HOUSE RECONVESES - SPEAKER RYAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE CONTI IN CHAIR	PAGE	6
REPRESENTATIVE DANIELS IN CHAIR	PAGE	24
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	64
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	70
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	72
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	75